

records concerning this application, Applicant has not found a form PTO-948 and asserts that this form was not enclosed.

Applicant respectfully requests that a form PTO-948 indicating the reasons for objection to the drawings be forwarded for review. Upon receipt, Applicant is prepared to file a supplemental response to address those specific objections. Therefore, Applicant submits that Applicant has been as fully responsive to this objection as is practicable.

Remarks

The Office Action mailed on July 19, 2000 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-28 are in the case. Claims 1-28 stand rejected. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art.

Thus, following amendment by this paper, claims 1- 28 are presented for examination. For the reasons set forth below, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Baron In view of Tsai and Wilf

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Baron (U.S. Patent 5,809,481) in view of Tsai (U.S. Patent 5,825,292) and Wilf (U.S. Patent 5,899,980).

Claim 1, recites "...the label, further provided with vendor data provided by the vendor and effective to execute on the first computer for presenting vendor information to the user." This feature relates to a label that provides data in a manner that allows the data to be executed on an arbitrary conventional user computer. Neither Baron, Tsai, nor Wilf disclose or suggest a label that provides data in a manner that allows the data to be executed on an arbitrary